

REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 26, 2003 has been received and carefully noted. Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added or amendments made which narrow the scope of any elements of any claims. Accordingly, Claims 1-2 and 5 are pending in this application and are submitted for consideration.

Regarding the drawings, the Office Action objected to Figures 2-4 on the grounds that these drawings showed the mixing of the contaminant-loaded seawater with raw seawater before oxidation, the opposite of what was claimed in Claim 1. However, Figure 2, which shows the mixing of the unoxidized, contaminant-loaded seawater with raw seawater, followed by the oxidation of the mixture of the unoxidized, contaminant-loaded seawater with raw seawater, is correct. Claim 1 has been amended to reflect what is shown in Figure 2. Consequently, no new matter has been added.

Regarding the objections to Figures 3 and 4, Applicant submits that these drawings are flowsheets. Namely, Figures 3 and 4 simply show that the seawater effluent from the gas-liquid contact apparatus, air and raw seawater are directed to the oxidation vessel, without determining any order. Figures 3 and 4 are thus correct as currently drawn in view of the amendments to Claim 1.

In view of the amendments to Claim 1, the objections to the drawings have been overcome and Applicant submits that corrected drawings are not required.

~~Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply~~
with the written description requirement. Namely, the Office Action states that Claim 1, step c claims the opposite of what is shown in Figure 2. Claim 1 has now been

amended to show the mixing of the unoxidized, contaminant-loaded seawater with raw seawater, followed by the oxidation of the mixture of the unoxidized, contaminant-loaded seawater with raw seawater. Thus, Claim 1 now reflects what is shown in Figure 2. As such, the amendment to Claim 1 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite with certain informalities being noted. Namely, the Office Action states that the phrase "in the case of using a perforated plate..." makes Claim 1 indefinite in view of the limitation of step c of claim 1 starting with the phrase "wherein the seawater..." Claim 1 has now amended to remove the phrase "in the case of using a perforated plate..." This amendment to Claim 1 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant requests that each of the pending claims be found allowable, and this application be passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,



Leo M. Loughlin
Registration No. 42,811

ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810